

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated March 24, 2003, claims 1, 3 to 10, and 12 to 26 are pending in the case. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 1, 2 to 10, and 12 to 14 are allowed.

The Examiner has rejected claims 15 to 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zibrik et al. (5,138,328). The Examiner stated essentially that Zibrik teaches or suggests all the claimed limitations of claims 15 to 18.

Claims 15 to 18 have been cancelled.

The Examiner has rejected claims 19 to 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snowdon (5,677,698). The Examiner stated essentially that Snowdon teaches or suggests all the limitations of claims 19 to 22.

Claim 19 claims "a conductive RF shielding foil disposed on the back of an electronic display having a hole; and a feed portion extending partially across the hole forming a slot antenna."

Snowdon teaches "a rectangular, 40 mm x3 mm slot". (Col. 2, lines 36 to 38.) Snowdon teaches a conductive portion of a coax cable extending completely across the slot. (See Fig. 2.) Snowdon does not disclose or suggest a slot antenna including "a feed portion extending partially across the hole forming a slot antenna" as claimed in claim 19. (Emphasis added.) Therefore, Snowdon fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 19. Claims 20 to 22 depend from

claim 19. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons given for claim 19. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claims 23 to 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snowdon in view of Zibrik and Rasinger et al. (5,365,246). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Snowdon, Zibrik, and Rasinger teach or suggest all the claimed limitations.

Claim 23 claims "a conductive RF shielding foil disposed on the back of an electronic display having a notch; and a feed portion extending partially across the notch forming an inverted-F antenna."

Snowdon teaches "a rectangular, 40 mm x3 mm slot". (Col. 2, lines 36 to 38.) Snowdon teaches a conductive portion of a coax cable extending completely across the slot. (See Fig. 2.) Snowdon does not disclose or suggest a slot antenna including "a feed portion extending partially across the notch forming an inverted-F antenna" as claimed in claim 23.

Zibrik teaches an antenna structure comprising a pair of printed circuit board antennas. (Col. 3, lines 3 to 7.) Zibrik teaches conductive elements 38 and 39 extending between a printed circuit board antenna and a counterpoise. (Col. 3, lines 59 to 66.) However, Zibrik does not teach or suggest "a feed portion extending partially across the notch forming an inverted-F antenna" as claimed in claim 23. (Emphasis added.) Thus, Zibrik fails to cure the deficiencies of Snowdon.

Rasinger teaches an antenna consisting essentially of two sheet-metal angles, which are

arranged adjacently to one another. (See Abstract.) Rasinger teaches, a feedline extending from a shielding housing, through a feedthrough and connected to the sheet-metal angle . (Col. 4, lines 28 to 30.) Thus, Rasinger teaches feedlines extending completely across a notch. Rasinger does not teach or suggest “a feed portion extending partially across the notch forming an inverted-F antenna” as claimed in claim 23. Accordingly, Rasinger fails to cure the deficiencies of Snowdon and Zibrik.

The combined teachings of Snowdon, Zibrik, and Rasinger fail to teach or suggest “a feed portion extending partially across the notch forming an inverted-F antenna” as claimed in claim 23. (Emphasis added.) Therefore, claim 23 is believed to be patentably distinct from the combined teachings of Snowdon, Zibrik, and Rasinger. The Examiner’s reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 24 to 26 depend from claim 23. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons given for claim 23. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, the application including claims 1, 3 to 10, 12 to 14, and 19 to 26 is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons stated above. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested. For the forgoing reasons, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLP
1900 Hempstead Turnpike, Suite 501
East Meadow, New York 11554
(516) 357-0091
(516) 357-0092 (FAX)